

**Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor's Name and Address:

HARRIS METHODIST HEB
3255 W PIONEER PKWY
ARLINGTON TX 76013

MFDR Tracking #: M4-07-3833-01

Respondent Name and Box #:

AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE CO.
Rep Box # 19**PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION**

Requestor's Position Summary: "...Few think that Medicare's reimbursement is Fair and Reasonable, as indicated by the commission's implementation of 140% of Medicare rates for physicians and 213.3% of Medicare rates for free standing surgical centers. The Medicare APC rate for this service is \$1704.59 times 140% is \$2386.43. We only received \$1159.80 in payment for this service-seriously below even the APC rate alone."

Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Total Amount Sought - \$1,268.43
3. Hospital Bill
4. EOBs

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: "It is the Respondents position that the Requestor was paid more than a fair and reasonable amount as determined in accordance with the criteria for payment under the ACT. Specifically, the amount paid by the Respondent was more than that which would be allowed under Medicare. Respondent has paid Requestor \$1118.00 which is the same amount that a full service hospital would be paid for its facility charges associated with a spinal surgery and a one-day inpatient hospitalization." ... "As the Requestor, the health care provider has the burden to proof that the fees paid were not fair and reasonable."

Principal Documentation:

1. Response to DWC 60

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
5/16/06	W10, W1, 16, W4	Outpatient Surgery	\$1,268.43	\$0.00
Total /Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division Rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Medical Reimbursement*, effective May 2, 2006 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:

- W10-No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement made based on insurance carrier fair and reasonable reimbursement methodology. Reduced to fair and reasonable.

- W1-Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment. When medically necessary, implantables & orthotics and prosthetics are reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10% per the Texas Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline.
 - 16-Claim/srvic lacks info which is needed for adjudication. In order to review this charge we need a copy of the invoice detailing the cost to the provider.
 - W4-No addl reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration. Reimbursement for your resubmitted invoice has been considered. No additional monies are being paid at this time. This bill was previously paid.
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgery services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 TexReg 3561, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers' compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that "Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available."
 3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
 4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all medical bill(s)"... "as originally submitted to the carrier and a copy of all medical bill(s) submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.250 of this chapter"... This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on February 23, 2007. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier and as submitted for reconsideration. The requestor did not submit a copy of the original bill. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A).
 5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(B), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB) relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing documentation providing evidence of carrier receipt of the request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of the EOB detailing the insurance carrier's response to the request for reconsideration. Nor has the requestor provided evidence of carrier receipt of the request for an EOB. The requestor did not submit a copy of the reconsideration EOB. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(B).
 6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include "the form DWC-60 table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form and manner prescribed by the Division"... A review of the documentation submitted finds that the requestor has indicated a different amount paid for the services in dispute on the *Table of Disputed Services* and on their position statement. On the *Table of Disputed Services* the requestor incorrectly listed \$1118.00 as the amount paid. Both parties indicated that the amount paid for the disputed services is \$1,159.80. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(C).
 7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E), effective December 31, 2006, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, 31 TexReg 10314, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all applicable medical records specific to the dates of service in dispute"... Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E).
 8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007 requires that the request shall include "a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include"... "how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues"... Review of the requestor's position statement finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not completed the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division as required by Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).
 9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007 requires that the request shall include "a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include"... "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue."... Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not completed the required sections of the

request in the form and manner prescribed by the Division as required by Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).

10. Division Rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to requests for medical fee dispute resolution filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable”... The requestor’s position statement asserts that “...Few think that Medicare’s reimbursement is Fair and Reasonable, as indicated by the commission’s implementation of 140% of Medicare rates for physicians and 213.3% of Medicare rates for free standing surgical centers. The Medicare APC rate for this service is \$1704.59 times 140% is \$2386.43. We only received \$1159.80 in payment for this service-seriously below even the APC rate alone.” The requestor did not list which APC was used in their position statement to determine the allowance. Furthermore, the requestor did not discuss or explain how it determined that the 140% Medicare rate would yield a fair and reasonable reimbursement. Nor did the requestor submit evidence, such as redacted EOBs showing typical carrier payments, nationally recognized published studies, Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, to support the proposed methodology. Nor has the requestor discussed how the proposed methodology would be consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011, or would ensure similar reimbursement to similar procedures provided in similar circumstances. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that the payment amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with 28 TAC §134.1. The request for additional reimbursement is not supported.
11. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(A), §133.307(c)(2)(B), §133.307(c)(2)(C), §133.307(c)(2)(E), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §133.250
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND/OR ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

11/24/2009

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.